DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 262 HE 006 638

AUTHOR Poduska, Paul R.
TITLE Student Affairs Research. A National Survey Report on University Programs.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire Univ., Durham.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Higher Education; *Management Systems; *National Surveys; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research Projects; Student Organizations; *Student Role

ABSTRACT

The current status of student affairs research programs at universities throughout the U.S. is examined in a survey project. The need for the development of student affairs management systems is cited. The questionnaire used in the survey covered four broad areas: (1) background information on responding institutions; (2) information about the organization and operation of research programs at responding institutions; (3) information about the nature of student affairs research and kinds of research projects being conducted; and (4) questionnaire assessment by the respondents. Of the 291 university campuses surveyed, 51 or 17.5 percent indicated that they were conducting student affairs research on a programmatic basis. Forty-six others had such research but without research project coordination by a specially delegated individual. The regional distributions of the programs were almost identical to those of the total population of institutions that were surveyed. The distributions by size and type of control of parent institutions were almost identical to the size and control type distributions of the 151 institutions that responded. More than 50 percent of the programs were located at institutions with total student enrollments of 15,000 or more and the majority of programs were at public institutions. Most programs had been in existence for more than one year and almost 50 percent for more than five. (LBH)

STUDENT AFFAIRS RESEARCH:

A National Survey Report on University Programs

Paul R. Poduska
Office of the Dean of Students
University of New Hampshire
Durham

In the spring of 1974, the Dean of Students Office at the University of New Hampshire conducted a survey project aimed at ascertaining the current status of student affairs research programs at universities around the country. The following is a report of the results of that study. I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Dr. Robert Wuerthner, Assistant Professor of Higher Education at the University of Massachusetts, for his assistance in reviewing the pilot instrument, to Dr. Stephen Smith, Instructor in Education at Keene State College, for his assistance in revising specific questionnaire items and reviewing the final draft of the instrument, to Ms. Candace Bancroft, my research assistant at that time and presently Assistant Director of Admissions at Keene State College, for her assistance in data processing, and to my secretary, Ms. Merry Jennison, for the many hours she put into the preparation of the materials for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In response to rising demands for institutional accountability during the past decade, institutions of higher education have become increasingly concerned about issues related to the need for improved allocation of institutional resources. This concern has manifested itself in several organizational development trends, one of which has been that institutions are placing higher priority upon the development of more effective management systems. Hopefully, these systems will enhance decision-making processes and thereby relieve the pressures created by scarce resources.

The various management systems that are being introduced into higher education cover almost every aspect of institutional behavior. Such innovations as cost-benefit analysis, non-traditional course contracting, resource requirements prediction models, program evaluation and review techniques and simulation models are only a few examples. In the midst of all of this it is becoming apparent that most management systems are very dependent on vast quantities of valid, reliable information. It is perhaps for this reason that institutions are allocating resources for the development of institutional research programs because the information needed to operate these systems is often non-existent or scattered throughout many departments.

Although institutional research is not a new administrative area in higher education, the relative importance of this field has only recently been recognized. During the past decade, many universities and colleges have created institutional research programs and will probably continue to develop them in the future. Most of these programs have experienced considerable success in such areas as analyzing physical space needs, compiling student records, organizing university budgets and computing enrollment, and grade point trends. Nevertheless, relatively little time, energy (and money) have been spent for the development of institutional research programs concerning student affairs and student personnel services. In those instances where students have been studied by institutional research programs, the majority of such research projects appear to have focused upon academic factors, such as the correlation of grade point averages with socioeconomic backgrounds. However, they have not placed enough emphasis upon the psychosocial dimensions of institutional environments and their interactions with the development of the "total student."

There is a need, then, for the development of student affairs research programs. Such programs would complement more traditional institutional research and provide useful information for decision-makers. The need for such research programs is gradually being

recognized as the thrust toward management systems filters downward through bureaucratic levels. It is also reflected in such works as Education and Identity by Arthur Chickering and The Impact of College on Students by Kenneth Feldman and Theodore Newcomb. Nevertheless, it seems that a relatively small number of these programs are being developed within divisions of student affairs at universities around the country. Likewise, information about these programs--their on-going projects, goals and organizational patterns--has not been systematically collected and studied.

In view of the potential importance of such programs for the development of student affairs management systems, a national survey was conducted in the spring of 1974 to begin a process of obtaining and providing information about student affairs research programs. This report presents the results of that survey.

General Methodological Considerations

The procedures involved in this study included (1) determination of the need for the study, (2) development of an appropriate instrument, (3) identification of the population to be sampled, (4) surveying of the population, (5) collection and coding of responses, (6) analysis and interpretation of data, and (7) reporting and assessment of the study. After the need for the study was established, a questionnaire was developed through a simulated pilot-study procedure which finally determined much of the content and scope of the instrument (see Appendix II). As the report indicates, the questionnaire covered four broad areas: (1) Background information on responding institutions, (2) Information about the organization and operation of research programs at responding institutions, (3) Information about the nature of student affairs research and kinds of research projects being conducted at responding institutions, and (4) A concluding section in which responding institutions were requested to assess the questionnaire itself.

The population to be sampled was determined by both project cost and data acquisition factors. It was decided that only "universities" would be surveyed in view of the assumption that larger institutions with a diversity of programs would be more likely to have student affairs research programs than would professional schools, four-year colleges, technical colleges, or junior colleges. The population of universities was identified from the A.C.E. master list of U. S. colleges and universities. Letters announcing the study, survey questionnaires, and follow-up letters were sent to 291 university campuses as well as a number of central offices in the continental and territorial United States.

In order to provide uniformity in regard to questionnaire completion, a set of instructions, which included a set of definitions of terms and directions for routing the instrument to an appropriate

person, were incorporated into the cover letter as page one of the six page questionnaire. Questionnaires were mailed to the Dean of Students at each institution who were in turn asked to forward the instrument to that staff member who was responsible for the broadest range of student affairs research projects in his or her respective division of student affairs. Each participant was provided with definitions of several key terms used in the survey including "Division," "Research," "Office," and "Program." To encourage participation in the study, each participant was also told that each responding institution would receive a copy of the results of the survey, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope was provided. From the outset it became apparent that the project might benefit from an on-going process of project-participant or "reciprocal" feedback. Such a feedback system was incorporated into the study in the form of questionnaire items aimed at survey-questionnaire assessment, a questionnaire item-check to determine which items were of greatest interest to participants, a report-request item on the questionnaire, a copy of the report sent to all respondents, and report assessment and data processing order blanks included along with the report.

The final self-select sample of 151 respondents was separated into three groups: Those institutions that were not involved in student affairs research (n=54), those that were conducting research projects on a non-programmatic basis (n=46), and those that did have student affairs research programs (n=51). All responses were then coded for data processing by institution campus; multi-campus universities were therefore not treated as one institution but as a system of individual campuses. Where possible, items on questionnaires that were left blank were treated as "no response"; otherwise, such items were coded as "none" or "no."

The final data base was the result of a number of sequential data recoding operations that were progressively compiled through a tape-building procedure using S.P.S.S. (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) programs. Multiple-response questionnaire items were treated as collections of individual variables unless the number of possible responses per item was less than four (a limitation of S.P.S.S. and available "core" space at UNH). Data analysis using S.P.S.S., level 5.01, included descriptive statistics for all variables, and cross-tabulation and Chi-Square analysis for a selected group of variables (see "Results"). The data were then reviewed for general response trends.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Of the 291 university campuses surveyed, 51 or 17.5% indicated that they were conducting student affairs research on a programmatic basis. 46 other institutions also indicated that they were conducting such research, but on a non-programmatic basis, that is, without research project coordination by an individual who was delegated with responsibility for conducting research. The regional geographic distributions of the programs were almost identical to those of the total population of institutions that were surveyed. The distributions of programs by size and type of control of parent institutions were almost identical to the size and control type distributions of the 151 institutions that responded. More than half of the programs were located at institutions with total student enrollments of 15,000 or more and the majority of programs were at public institutions. Most programs had been in existence for more than one year and almost half had been in existence for more than five years.

Program Organization and Resources

The second section of the survey questionnaire was concerned with the organization and resources of research programs. Almost half of the programs had at least one full-time staff member whereas a majority had at least one part-time staff member. Over half of the programs (54.9%) had two-to-four part-time staff. All of the programs had a director or person who assumed a similar responsibility full- or part-time. A majority of these persons reported to an upper-echelon student affairs administrator.

Program resources (aside from staffing) included financial and computational resources. Financial resources were separated into "divisional" and "outside" funding. The majority of programs received from one to three percent of their divisional budgets and no funding from outside sources. However, a third of the programs did obtain more than three percent of their divisional budget for research and 20% of the programs received some funding from outside sources. More than half of the programs planned to put more effort into seeking outside funding. The number of full-time staff was directly proportional to the extent of divisional program funding, and the extent of outside funding was inversely proportional to divisional funding of programs.

Computational resources were measured in terms of accessibility and adequacy of computer facilities and the use of statistical packages for data processing and analysis. Almost one-half of the programs indicated that their facilities were both accessible and adequate. However, over half stated that their facilities were not sufficiently accessible.

Sixty-two percent of the programs reported that they used statistical packages for their data processing and analysis. In general, the number of full-time staff was inversely proportional to the use of statistical packages.

Program Processes and Content

The third section of the questionnaire was directed toward the kinds of research that programs conducted, how they proceeded with this process, and what subjects or areas of research they were investigating. "Kinds of research" referred to the extent to which programs were involved in experimental, non-experimental, and/or evaluation research. Of those that were, almost half devoted 20% or less of their resources to this kind of research. In contrast, almost all programs were involved in both non-experimental and evaluation research. Two-thirds of the programs devoted over forty percent of their resources to non-experimental research, and more than half of the programs devoted over twenty percent of their resources to evaluation research. In general, the extent to which programs were involved in non-experimental research was directly proportional to the number of part-time program staff and the use of statistical packages.

The majority of items in section three of the questionnaire focused upon how programs proceeded to do research. The topics included instrumentation, intrainstitutional collaboration, program purposes and goals, research design and decision-making, education of colleagues, research and accountability, research problem areas, desire for interinstitutional cooperation, future research directions, and involvements in longitudinal research.

-- Instrumentation: The majority of programs used very few instruments that were not of their own design. Of the nationally standardized instruments that were used, the College and University Environmental Scale, the College Student Questionnaire, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, were used most often. Use of the O.P.I. was directly proportional to the extent of program involvement in experimental research. On the other hand, use of the C.U.E.S. was inversely proportional to the extent to which programs were engaged in evaluation research.

-- Intrainstitutional Collaboration: The extent of program collaboration with offices of institutional research, academic departments, and non-divisional administrative departments was evenly distributed across these three areas. Collaboration was not extensive; almost one-half of the programs indicated that ten percent or less of their projects were collaborative endeavors. However, programs at public institutions indicated a much higher degree of collaboration than programs at private

institutions. Collaboration with non-divisional administrative departments was directly proportional to both institutional size and the number of years programs were in existence. Collaboration with academic departments was directly proportional to program involvements in experimental research projects.

-- Program Purposes and Goals: Program purposes were quite varied but often fell into two broad categories, "evaluation of services and programs," and "obtaining and providing information about student needs and interests." Goals statements separated into eight categories; the largest percentages of goal statements fell into the categories of "Student Characteristics," "Evaluation and Assessment," and "Management Information Systems." Both purpose and goal statements were rated in terms of their degree of vagueness/articulateness; the majority of responses for both purposes and goals were rated from average to vague.

-- Research Design and Decision-Making: More than half of the programs indicated that over half of their projects included the information needs of decision-makers in their project designs. The extent of decision-maker input was directly proportional to institutional size, the number of part-time program staff, and the extent to which programs designed their own instruments.

-- Education of Colleagues about Research: Almost half of the programs spent up to ten percent of their time for educating their colleagues about research. One-third of the programs devoted more than 10% to this endeavor.

-- Research and Accountability: Almost all programs indicated that they viewed research as a contribution to student affairs accountability. This view was directly proportional to the extent to which programs included decision-maker input into their project designs.

-- Research Problems: Those problems most often encountered by programs included insufficient funds, difficulty in assessing administrative information needs, problems with project design, evaluation of research, deciding upon or designing appropriate instrumentation, processing of data, and reporting of results. The problem of evaluation of research was limited to public institutions and directly proportional to institutional size. Problems with project design, instrumentation, and reporting were predominantly associated with programs that had either small or large full-time staffs.

-- Interinstitutional Cooperation: A majority of programs were interested in sharing information, and over half expressed interest in cooperative project design efforts. One-third were also interested in cost-sharing; their interest was evenly distributed across all NASPA regions.

-- Future Research Areas: By far the greatest commitment to future research was in the area of student affairs program evaluation. Other areas which received substantial commitments were management-by-objectives (M.B.O.), programming-planning-budgeting systems (P.P.B.S.), management information systems (M.I.S.), and model building. Future commitments to program evaluation were directly proportional to the number of full-time program staff; program plans to engage in simulation projects were directly proportional to the extent of divisional funding of programs. Almost all of those programs that planned to engage in management-related research viewed research as a contribution to student affairs accountability.

-- Involvement in Longitudinal Research: Over half of the programs were involved in some aspect of longitudinal research.

The last part of Section III dealt with what subjects or areas of research programs were studying. The area of student attitude assessments received the highest overall program involvement. Other areas of substantial involvement included student need assessments, orientation programming, counseling and testing, academic advising, housing, financial aid, and career planning and placement. The areas of staff training, student organizations, admissions, recreation, judicial systems, food services and office management received a lesser degree of program involvement. A small number of programs also indicated involvements in twenty-nine other areas.

Assessment of the Survey

The last section of the survey instrument included items pertaining to questionnaire assessment. A majority of the respondents indicated that the questionnaire was educational and/or informative. Two-thirds rated the instrument as complete; those that did not expressed interest in a variety of specific research topics. Each of these topics was mentioned by two percent or fewer of the respondents. All but one program wanted a copy of the results of the survey.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY--PART I: DESCRIPTIVE DATA

A. Characteristics of the "Population" and "Program" Samples

Sample Sizes: Of the 291 university campuses surveyed (see Appendix I), 151 or 51.9% responded. Of these 151 respondents (hereafter referred to as the "population sample"), 51 or 33.8% (hereafter referred to as the "program sample") indicated that they had student affairs research programs. 46 institutions or 30.5% of the population sample indicated that they were conducting student affairs research projects on a non-programmatic basis.

Geographic Distribution: Using the regional institutional designations of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the geographic distribution of the population sample was almost identical to the distribution of the campuses surveyed. The geographic distribution of the program sample varied within ± 5% of the population sample across all regions.

Institution Size: The percent sample of institutions by institution size, that is, by total student enrollments, varied as follows:

	UNDER 1,000	1,000-5,000	5,000-10,000	10,000-15,000	15,000-20,000	OVER 20,000
Population Sample	2.0%	29.1%	19.6%	12.2%	16.2%	20.9%
Program Sample	0.0%	11.7%	19.6%	15.7%	25.5%	27.5%

Type of Control: The distribution of institutions by type of institutional

control was almost identical for both population and program samples:

	Public	Private
Population Sample	79.3%	20.7%
Program Sample	80.4%	19.6%

Current Research and/or Evaluation Efforts: The distribution of institutions by general research emphases varied as follows:

	Research	Evaluation	Both Research and Evaluation	Neither
Population Sample	7.9%	17.9%	38.4%	35.8%
Program Sample	7.9%	17.7%	74.5%	---

Length of Time in Existence: The distribution of institutions by the number of years engaged in research was somewhat similar for both population and program samples:

	Less Than One Year	One to Three Yrs.	Three to Five Yrs.	More Than Five Yrs.
Population Sample	16.5%	32.0%	16.5%	35.0%
Program Sample	12.0%	28.0%	18.0%	42.0%

Plans to Engage in Research: 54.9% of the institutions in the population sample that did not have student affairs research programs indicated that they plan to become engaged in such research.

B. Characteristics of the Program Sample

The following is a summary of the descriptive data on the 51 student affairs research programs. (See Appendix III)

1. Program Organization and Resources:

Staff Size: More than half or 54.0% of the respondents indicated that they had no full-time research staff. The distribution of the remaining 46.0% that did have full-time staff was as follows: One staff member, 26.0%; two or three members, 14.0%; four or more members, 6.0%.

In contrast to the data on full-time staff, 82.4% of the programs did have two or more part-time staff as follows: one staff member, 13.7%; two to four members, 54.9%; five to eight members, 27.5%.

Staff Organization: All of the programs indicated that they had a director of research or a staff member who assumed a similar responsibility. Although these persons reported to a variety of higher-echelon administrators, more than half or 54.3% reported to either a "Dean of Student Affairs" (32.6%) or "Vice President for Student Affairs" (21.7%). The remaining 45.7% reported to a wide variety of personnel across academic, student personnel, and campus-wide administrative departments.

Resources, Financial: Financial resources for research programs were identified in two separate categories: percent of 1973-74 Division budget, and percent of 1973-74 budget from outside sources. 69.4% of the programs indicated that their research budget comprised one to three percent of their divisional budgets. 22.4$ indicated receiving four to six percent and 6.0% received seven to ten percent of their division budgets. Only 2.0% of the respondents received more than 10%.

In regard to outside or "soft" funding, 76.5% received none, 13.7% received one to five percent, 3.9% received six to ten percent, 3.9% received eleven to twenty percent, and 2.0% (one institution) received more than forty percent of its financial resources for research from outside sources. More than half of the respondents or 54.0% planned to put more effort into seeking outside funding; 42.0% anticipated no change and 4.0% planned to spend less time seeking such resources.

Resources, Computational: 47.1% of those that responded indicated that their computer facilities were adequate. Almost half or 49.0% indicated that their facilities were both adequate and accessible. 3.9% indicated that their facilities were neither adequate nor accessible. Almost a majority of the respondents or 62.7% indicated that they use some form of packaged statistical program for part or all of their data processing.

2. Program Process and Content:

Kinds of Research Conducted: Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of their resources that were allocated for "experimental," "non-experimental," and "evaluation" research. The results were as follows:

"Experimental Research"

1 to 10%	10 to 20%	20 to 40%	More Than 40%	None
38.8%	10.2%	8.2%	0.0%	42.8%

"Non-Experimental Research"

1 to 10%	10 to 20%	20 to 40%	40 to 70%	More Than 70%	None
18.0%	12.0%	22.0%	26.0%	14.0%	8.0%

"Evaluation Research"

1 to 10%	10 to 20%	20 to 40%	40 to 70%	More Than 70%	None
22.0%	16.0%	40.0%	18.0%	0.0%	4.0%

Instrumentation: A majority or 70.0% of the respondents indicated that at least 50% of their research is conducted with instrumentation of their own design. 46.0% indicated using more than 80% whereas 14.0% indicated using 20% or fewer instruments of their own design.

The percentage of respondents who used standardized instruments not of their own design was as follows: College and University Environmental Scale, 43.1%; College Student Questionnaire, 33.3%; Omnibus Personality Inventory, 27.5%; Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, 25.5%; College Characteristics Inventory, 15.7%; Adjective Check List, 13.7%; Institutional Goals Inventory, 13.7%. Twenty-one other types of validated instruments were used by 8.0% or fewer of the respondents.

Intrainstitutional Collaborative Research: Results indicated that the percent of research collaboration between student affairs research programs and other university departments was almost evenly distributed across the following institutional areas:

	Percent Collaboration				
	1 to 10%	10 to 30%	30 to 50%	More Than 50%	None
Office of Institutional Research	44.9%	12.2%	6.1%	4.1%	32.7%
Academic Departments	46.9%	22.5%	6.1%	2.0%	22.5%
Other Administrative Depts. (non-divisional)	43.8%	22.9%	8.3%	0.0%	25.0%

Research Purposes and Goals: Respondents were asked to state both the purpose(s) and goals of their research programs (see Appendix IV). The largest percentages of purpose statements fell into two broad categories, "evaluation of services and programs" (approximately 30%), and "obtaining and providing information about student needs and interests" (approximately 15%). The remaining purpose statements (approximately 55%) covered a wide variety of topics from "stimulating program development" and "providing recommendations for policies reviews" to very vague statements such as "conduct research" or "improve student services" to very specific purposes such as "evaluate faculty perceptions of student services" or "evaluate withdrawal procedures." More than half or 56.9% of the respondents provided multi-purpose rather than single-purpose statements. All purpose statements were rated on a scale of one to five in terms of their degree of articulateness or ambiguity. 2.2% of the purpose statements were rated as "very vague," 50.0% were rated as "vague," 30.4% as "average," 8.7% as "articulate," and 8.7% as "very articulate." 11.8% of the respondents did not distinguish between their purpose and goal statements.

In contrast to statements of purpose, goals statements

clustered into eight more distinct groupings. The percent distribution of prioritized program goals for each goal category was as follows:

	Student Characteristics	Environmental Characteristics	Organization Development	Management Information Systems
Priority #1	42.5%	2.1%	6.4%	10.6%
Priority #2	27.2%	4.5%	6.8%	18.2%
Priority #3	11.1%	2.8%	8.3%	16.7%

(continued)

	Evaluation and Assessment	Research Development	General Self-Studies	General Statements
Priority #1	19.1%	2.1%	2.1%	14.9%
Priority #2	20.4%	2.3%	0.0%	20.4%
Priority #3	22.2%	8.3%	2.8%	27.8%

Goal statements for each priority level were rated on an ambiguity-articulation scale identical to that used for purpose statements. In general there was a slight decrease in the level of goal articulation as the goal priority level decreased. The number of goals statements for each level also decreased as the priority level decreased.

Research Design and Decision-Making: More than half or 57.1% of the respondents indicated that more than 50% of their research was intentionally designed to meet the information needs of student affairs decision-makers. Only 6.1% of the respondents indicated that 10% or less of their projects were designed with such decision-maker input.

Education of Colleagues about Research: Almost half or 43.8% of the respondents indicated that up to 10% of their time was spent educating their colleagues about student affairs research. 33.3% spent from 10 to 30% of their time at this endeavor, and 4.2% spent from 30 to 50% of their time in this manner.

Research and Accountability: The vast majority or 94.0% of the respondents indicated that they viewed their research programs as contributing to accountability in the area of Student Affairs. The remaining 6.0% were either undecided about this issue (4.0%) or in disagreement with the majority view (2.0%).

Research Problems: The greatest problem that confronted research programs was that of adequate funding. 54.9% of the respondents indicated that this was their primary problem. Other problems included assessment of administrative needs (47.1%), project design (41.2%), evaluation of research (41.2%), appropriate instrumentation (35.3%), data processing (33.3%), reporting of results (23.5%), insufficient time (5.9%), and inadequate staffing (2%).

Interinstitution Cooperation: Respondents indicated interest in interinstitutional cooperation in the following areas: Information sharing (88.2%), project design (58.8%), cost-sharing (33.3%), and in-service workshops (2.0%).

Future Research Directions: A majority of the respondents (72.5%) planned to become involved in program evaluation. Other future research areas included management-by-objectives (45.1%),

program-planning-budgeting systems (27.5%), management information systems (25.5%), model building (23.5%), and simulation studies (9.8%).

Research Areas: Respondents were asked to indicate their past and present research projects and future plans for conducting research in a variety of student affairs areas. The area of student attitude assessments received the highest overall involvement (88.2%). Other areas of high research involvement were student needs assessments (82.3%), orientation programming (76.5%), counseling and testing (68.6%), academic advising (62.7%), housing (62.7%), financial aid (56.9%), career planning and placement (49.0%), staff training (47.0%), student organizations (45.1%), admissions (43.1%), recreation (43.1%), judicial systems (33.3%), food services (29.4%), and office management (29.4%). 29 other areas were also indicated by respondents. However, each of these areas was only cited by 4% or less of the respondents.

Longitudinal Research: Over half or 58.3% of the respondents indicated they were engaged in the design, implementation, and/or evaluation of longitudinal research projects.

Information Sharing: All the respondents indicated interest in receiving some sort of student affairs research newsletter.

3. Assessment of the Survey and Questionnaire:

Value of the Questionnaire: 73.9% of the respondents indicated that the questions asked in the survey were educational and/or informative.

Questionnaire Completeness: 68.4% of the respondents indicated that the questionnaire was complete, that is, that critical areas were not omitted. Those respondents who did indicate omissions (31.6%) cited a wide variety of specific research subjects from evaluation of specific services and programs to information about specialized cost-benefit systems and management techniques. Each of these specific topics was mentioned by 2% or less of the respondents.

Questionnaire Completion Time: More than half or 52.0% of the respondents completed the questionnaire within ten to twenty minutes. 28.0% completed it within ten minutes and 20.1% needed more than twenty minutes.

Feedback: 98.0% of the respondents indicated that they wanted a copy of the results of the survey.

Interest in Specific Questionnaire Items: Respondents were most interested in item III-J, which dealt with the kinds of research problems encountered by research programs. A high degree of interest was also indicated in the following items: I-E, Current Research and/or Evaluation Efforts; III-F, Research Goals; III-G, Research Designed for Decision-Makers; II-A, Full-Time Staffing; III-B, Use of Validated Instruments; III-I, Research and Accountability. (See Appendix II for specific questionnaire items corresponding to the above item numbers.)

RESULTS OF THE STUDY -- PART II: CROSSTABULATION

The following is a partial summary of the results obtained from the crosstabulation of responses to eleven questionnaire items by responses to all other items. Given the limited space for reporting survey results, only those crosstabulations that may be of interest to the greatest number of respondents and that were found to be significant at $p \leq .05$ using the Chi-Square Statistic are reported. The eleven items selected for crosstabulation are (A) Geographic Distribution, (B) Institutional Size, (C) Type of Institution Control, (D) Number of Years Engaged in Programmatic Research, (E) Full-Time Staffing, (F) Research Budget Allocation, Kinds of Research Conducted--(G) Experimental, (H) Non-Experimental, and (I) Evaluation Research, (J) Extent of Decision-Maker Design Input, and (K) The Contribution of Research to Division Accountability.

A. Geographic Distributions:

1. And Institutional Control: With the exception of Region Two, the distribution of the program sample by type of institutional control within N.A.S.P.A. regional designations was similar for all regions or 80.4% public and 10.6% private. The distribution within Region Two was 36.4% public and 63.6% private. ($p \leq .0049$)

2. And Interinstitution Cooperation: Interest in interinstitutional cooperation in the area of project cost-sharing was distributed

rather evenly across all regions. ($p \leq .0474$)

3. And Future Research Plans: Programs in Regions One, Three, and Four-East expressed considerable interest in the area of Management Information Systems (M.I.S.). ($p \leq .0141$)

B. Institutional Size (Total Student Enrollments):

1. And Institutional Control: The percentage of programs at public institutions was directly proportional to institutional size, whereas the percentage of programs at private institutions was inversely proportional to institutional size. The majority of programs (80.4%) were at public institutions and over half of the programs (51.0%) were at public institutions with enrollments of 15,000 or more. ($p \leq .0045$)

2. And Collaboration with Non-Divisional Administrative Departments: In general, the extent of program collaboration with non-divisional administrative departments was directly proportional to institutional size. The exceptions were those programs at institutions with enrollments of 5,000 to 10,000 (the predominantly private college group). ($p \leq .0056$)

3. And Decision-Maker Input: The degree to which research programs intentionally designed their projects around the information needs of decision-makers was, in general, directly proportional to institutional size. ($p \leq .0006$)

4. And Research Problems--Evaluation of Research: Of those

institutions that did indicate that the evaluation of research was a problem (41.2%), 57.1% were at institutions with enrollments over 20,000. In general, the percentage of respondents who indicated that research evaluation was a problem was directly proportional to institutional size. ($p \leq .0019$)

5. And Present Research Areas: Only one area of research was significantly associated with institutional size--"student needs assessments." Most programs were very involved in this area and more than half indicated having past, present and future commitments to needs assessments. Institutions under 1,000 and over 20,000 appeared to have the most rapid rate of growth of interest in this area. ($p \leq .0081$)

C. Institutional Control:

1. And Collaboration with Academic Departments: More than half or 51.3% of those research programs that were at public institutions developed from one to ten percent of their research projects in collaboration with academic departments. On the other hand, 60.0% of the programs that were at private institutions indicated no collaboration at all with academic departments. ($p \leq .0321$)

2. And Collaboration with Non-Divisional Administrative Departments: Half of those programs at public institutions (50.0%) indicated that one to ten percent of their projects were developed in collaboration with non-divisional administrative departments. On the other hand, 60.0% of those programs at private institutions

were not involved at all in this type of collaboration. ($p \leq .0304$)

3. And Research Problems--Evaluation of Research: 51.2% of those programs that were at public institutions indicated that they had problems with the evaluation of research. All of the programs at private institutions indicated that they do not have problems in this area. ($p \leq .0095$)

4. And Present Research Areas--Orientation: More than half of those programs at public institutions indicated they had been, were, and would continue to be involved in orientation projects whereas only 25.0% of those programs at private institutions indicated a similar commitment. In addition, 75.0% of these programs indicated they would not be conducting research in this area in the future. ($p \leq .0023$)

D. Number of Years in Existence:

1. And Collaboration with Non-Divisional Administrative Departments: The number of years that programs were in existence was directly proportional to the degree to which programs were involved in collaborative research endeavors with non-divisional administrative departments. ($p \leq .0499$)

2. And Research Areas--Orientation; Student Organizations: In general, program involvements and commitments to orientation research projects in the past, present, and future were directly proportional to the number of years that programs had been in existence. ($p \leq .0009$) This trend also was evident for programmatic research in

the area of student organizations; however, those programs that were in existence for one to five years indicated a greater commitment to this area in the present and future but not in the past. ($p \leq .0322$)

E. Number of Full-Time Staff:

1. And Level of Divisional Funding: The number of full-time program staff was directly proportional to the level of divisional funding. ($p \leq .0008$) Of those programs that indicated having full-time staff, more than half or 54.5% indicated receiving from one to three percent of their division budget for research. Of the remaining programs, 60.0% reported that they receive from four to six percent of their division budget for research. ($p \leq .0008$)

2. And Use of Statistical Packages: In general, full-time staff size was inversely proportional to the use of statistical packages for data processing. Of those programs with two or three full-time members, 71.4% did not use such packages. In contrast, 92.3% of those programs with only one staff member and all of those programs with four or more members used statistical packages. ($p \leq .0125$)

3. And the Contribution of Research to Divisional Accountability: 95.6% of those programs that did have one or more full-time staff indicated that they thought that student affairs research contributes to divisional accountability. ($p \leq .0078$)

4. And Research Problems--Project Design, Instrumentation, and Reporting: A majority of those programs which had either one or

four or more full-time staff members indicated that they encountered problems in the areas of project design, instrumentation, and reporting. On the other hand, a majority of those programs that had two or three full-time members indicated having none of these problems. ($p \leq .0078$, .0092, and .0054 respectively)

5. And Future Research Plans--Evaluation of Student Affairs Programs: In general, the number of full-time staff was directly proportional to future commitments to become involved in program evaluation. However, all of those programs with four or more staff members indicated that this was not an area of future commitment. ($p \leq .0079$)

F. Percent of Divisional Budget Allocated for Student Affairs Research Programs:

1. And Percent of Budget from Outside Sources: In general, the percent of divisional funds allocated for research programs was inversely proportional to the percent of program funding from outside sources. Of those programs that received funding from outside sources, 58.3% received from one to three percent from their divisional budget and from one to five percent from outside sources. ($p \leq .0037$)

2. And Future Research Plans--Simulations: Program plans to become involved in simulation studies were directly proportional to the percent allocation of divisional funds for research. ($p \leq .0149$)

3. And Present Research Areas: Three research areas were signifi-

cantly "associated" with percent allocation of divisional funds ($p \leq .0500$); they were counseling and testing, admissions, and recreation. The extent of program involvements in the areas of counseling and testing and admissions was inversely proportional to percent allocation of division funds. ($p \leq .0313$ and $.0258$ respectively) The area of recreation broke from this pattern; unlike the previously mentioned areas, programs indicated that recreation was and would be receiving more research attention than in the past, especially from those programs whose divisional allocations were from four to six percent. ($p \leq .0211$)

G. Kinds of Research--Experimental:

1. And Use of Standardized Instruments--The CUES and O.P.I.: In general, use of the College and University Environmental Scale (C.U.E.S.) was curvilinearly proportional to the degree to which programs were involved in experimental research. ($p \leq .0096$) The highest usage of the C.U.E.S. was by those programs that allocated one to ten percent of their resources for experimental research; the lowest usage was by those programs which conducted no experimental research and those which were most involved in experimental research (those that allocated from 20 to 40% of their resources to experimental research).

In contrast to the C.U.E.S., program use of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (O.P.I.) was directly proportional to the extent to which programs were involved in experimental research. ($p \leq .0384$) Of those programs that were involved in experimental research, 61.3% used the O.P.I. and 77.3% used the C.U.E.S.

2. And Extent of Collaboration with Academic Departments: In general, the extent to which programs were involved in experimental research was directly proportional to the extent to which these programs collaborated with academic departments. ($p \leq .0055$)

3. And Future Research Plans--M.B.O.: 71.4% of those programs that were not conducting experimental research also did not have plans to become involved in Management by Objectives (M.B.O.). Of those programs that did indicate involvement in experimental research (57.1%), 53.6% reported that they had plans to engage in research endeavors related to M.B.O. ($p \leq .0308$).

4. And Present Research Areas--Placement: In general, the extent of program involvement in experimental research was directly proportional to program involvement in research that concerned career planning and placement services. ($p \leq .0017$)

H. Kinds of Research--Non-Experimental:

1. And Number of Part-Time Research Staff: In general, the extent to which programs were involved in non-experimental research was directly proportional to the number of part-time program staff members. Of those programs involved in non-experimental research (92.0%), 4.3% had no part-time staff members, 8.7% had one member, 58.7% had from two to four members, and 28.3% had from five to eight part-time members. ($p \leq .0218$)

2. And Use of Statistical Packages: The extent to which programs were involved in non-experimental research was, in general, directly

proportional to the use of statistical packages for data analysis. However, the distribution of the data (for this pairing of items) was curvilinear and bimodal. Of those programs which indicated that ten to twenty percent of their research was non-experimental (12.0%), 50.0% reported using statistical packages (the low point on the curve). Of those programs which indicated that forty to seventy percent of their research was non-experimental (26.0%), 92.3% reported using statistical packages (the high point on the curve). ($p \leq .0094$)

3. And Inter-Institutional Cooperation: Interest in interinstitutional cooperation was almost evenly distributed across all ranges of extent of program involvement in non-experimental research. (8.0% of the respondents expressed interest in a variety of kinds of cooperative endeavors.) ($p \leq .0386$)

4. And Present Research Areas--Housing Services; Recreation Programming: The extent of program involvement in non-experimental research was directly proportioned to the extent of program involvement in the areas of housing services and recreation programming. However, programs indicated that the area of housing services had and would receive a steadily increasing amount of research involvement, ($p \leq .0009$) whereas the area of recreation programming in general would receive no noticeable change in the extent of research involvement. ($p \leq .0041$)

I. Kinds of Research--Evaluation:

-- And Use of Standardized Instruments--C.U.E.S.: In general, use of the C.U.E.S. was inversely proportional to the extent of program

involvement in evaluation research. This general pattern was established by those programs which reported not using it, although there was a slight direct proportional increase in terms of those programs that did use it. ($p \leq .0442$)

J. Research Design and Decision-Maker Input:

1. And the Number of Part-Time Research Staff: The number of part-time program staff members was directly proportional to the extent to which programs intentionally designed their research projects in terms of the information needs of decision-makers. However, this trend was curvilinear and asymptotic beginning in the area of two-to-four staff members at thirty to fifty percent input. ($p \leq .0107$)

2. And the Use of Standardized Instruments: Of those programs that included decision-maker input into their research design (96.0%), 85.7% indicated that they did not use standardized instruments. In general, the use of such instruments was inversely proportional to the degree to which programs intentionally incorporated the information needs of decision-makers into the design of their research projects. The only substantial use of standardized instruments was by those projects (12.3%) that indicated that from ten to fifty percent of their projects included such design input. ($p \leq .0374$)

3. And the Percent of Instrumentation That is Self-Designed: The extent to which programs included decision-maker input into project design was directly proportional to the extent to which instrumentation was self-designed. ($p \leq .0112$)

4. And the Contribution of Research to Accountability: Of those programs that indicates that research does contribute to accountability (93.9%), 60.9% reported that more than 50% of their research included decision-maker input. The extent of such input was directly proportional to respondent indications that research did contribute to accountability. ($p \leq .0328$)

5. And Present Research Areas--Student Attitudes; Housing: The extent of decision-maker input was directly proportional to the extent of research involvement in the areas of student attitudes and housing services. ($p \leq .0031$ and .0063 respectively) Most programs indicated a definite commitment to these areas in the future.

K. The Contribution of Student Affairs Research to Divisional Accountability:

1. And Future Research Areas: Of those programs that indicated having plans to engage in management-oriented research projects (90.0%), 95.6% thought that student affairs research contributed to divisional accountability. ($p \leq .0094$)

2. And Present Research Areas--Assessment of Student Needs: Of those programs that indicated that research does contribute to accountability (92.7%), 95.3% indicated that they had been, were, and would be conducting research in the area of student needs assessments. ($p \leq .0281$)

CONCLUSIONS

If the findings of this study can be generalized to the total population of university campuses surveyed, then we can assume that not fifty-one but rather eighty to one-hundred student affairs research programs exist at universities around the country. In all likelihood these programs are comprised of projects which vary markedly in their subject matter, scope and research processes. Nevertheless, in spite of this diversity most if not all are probably similar in one respect, that is, they reflect the increased emphasis that institutions are placing upon management information systems.

During the past decade substantial national and international socioeconomic changes have resulted in the attenuation of available institutional resources. In the midst of shortages and subsequent organizational changes, institutions of higher education are turning to more sophisticated decision-making processes in order to become more proficient in the identification, acquisition, distribution and reallocation of both internal and external resources. Curricular innovations, for example, such as experiential learning and interdisciplinary studies often necessitate non-traditional or criterion-referenced evaluation and new staffing patterns. "The new student in higher education" is placing new demands upon existing recruitment and admissions practices and often needs non-traditional student services such as learning skills, academic counseling, life planning and outreach programs. Increased interest in campus-wide involvement in institutional governance is requiring greater communication between a wide diversity of campus groups. Reduced legislative appropriations and concomitant demands for accountability are compelling institutions to develop methods for reexamining their missions and restructuring their priorities. New patterns of financing and refinancing institutions, such as market research and consortia projects, are placing increased emphasis upon program evaluation and new hiring practices. And, amidst all of these changes, institutions are also redefining their purposes and goals so that institutional functioning can be more accurately monitored on a continuous basis.

These and other changes in institutional organization and behavior have placed a high premium upon large quantities of reliable, valid information--the cornerstone of management systems. It is at this juncture that one might expect student affairs research to become a necessary component of any effectively managed institution. For if management necessitates information, then information necessitates research. Indeed this is the situation that is depicted in the results of this study. The fifty-one student affairs research programs reflected both the impact of declining institutional resources and the subsequent trend toward management information systems.

One example of this trend is the extent to which programs used innovations in electronic data processing. For instance, a majority of the programs relied upon packaged, that is, user-oriented statistical programs and/or standardized instruments for at least part of their data acquisition and analysis. These and other innovations in computer-related technologies are enhancing the cost-effectiveness of conducting institutional research and are opening up possibilities for student affairs research at institutions of every size. In addition, such innovations are facilitating the integration of research programs into the decision-making structure of institutions. Recent advances in on-line, real-time computer systems and management-oriented data base and retrieval packages are enabling decision-makers to have rapid access to the varieties of institutional data that research programs provide. In this manner the information obtained by researchers is becoming more available to decision-makers and is placing increased emphasis upon the importance of institutional research as an integral component of management information systems.

Another reflection of the trend toward management information systems is the extent to which student affairs researchers were involved with both divisional and non-divisional staff and student affairs decision-makers. Although the amount of overall interdepartmental collaboration was not extensive, it was evenly distributed across divisional, non-divisional and academic departments and was associated with specific kinds of research. For example, the extent to which programs were involved in experimental research was directly proportional to the extent to which programs collaborated with academic departments. Within their divisions, researchers spent a considerable amount of time educating student affairs personnel about the value and use of research. In addition, programs also indicated that they allocated a substantial amount of time for collaboration with student affairs decision-makers for the express purpose of integrating decision-making priorities into the design of research projects. All of these factors taken together indicate that research programs set their priorities in terms of existing institutional resources and the management information needs of administrators.

A third example of the trend toward management information systems is seen in the kinds of problems confronting programs and in their plans for future research. With the exception of financial problems, all of the problems that programs specified were directly related to the areas of management and decision-making. Evaluation of research, project design, reporting of results, and assessment of administrative information needs were typical examples. All of these problems are viewed as a consequence of the need for more sophisticated management practices. Similarly, the future plans of research programs often included management-related projects such as program evaluation, simulation studies and research in the areas of management-by-objectives and/or programming-planning-budgeting-systems. In addition, the fact that evaluation research, which is an essential component of any management system, was both a problem and

future research area provides further support for the conclusion that student affairs research programs reflect the trend toward management information systems.

A final example of this trend is the extent to which program purpose and goal statements were related to management processes. For instance, the most often occurring categories of purpose statements, "(to) evaluate program effectiveness using student needs" and "(to) provide student characteristics information to campus groups," and the most often occurring categories of goal statements, "student characteristics" and "evaluation and assessment," are both necessary components of any effective management system. That is, the identification of student needs and interests is essential for the derivation of program goals; similarly, the evaluation of programs is necessary in order to determine whether or not such needs were met. In addition to the fact that these categories were related to management processes, many goal statements fell into the distinct category of "management information systems." The extent to which programs specified M.I.S.-related goals by both goal priority levels and kinds of research conducted is shown in the following table. In general, the M.I.S. category was the third most often occurring goal category and the extent to which programs provided M.I.S.-related goals was inversely proportional to the extent to which goal statements fell into other first-priority categories. Furthermore, goal statements which fell into the M.I.S. category were most often provided by those programs that had a greater involvement in evaluation versus experimental and non-experimental research. It appears that the conclusion to be drawn from the frequency of occurrence of various purpose and goal statements is that the primary purposes and goals of student affairs research programs are directly related to the development and maintenance of management information systems.

If the above examples of the trend toward management information systems reflect institutional responses to decreasing resources, then one might expect that the impact of scarce resources would also be reflected in the organization and behavior of these programs. In fact, this does seem to be the situation, especially in the areas of program staffing, funding, research problems, and interest in inter-institutional cooperation. In view of the potential contribution of student affairs research to divisional and institutional decision-making and accountability, one might also expect that the majority of programs would have a full-time staff member. However, this was not the case; less than half of the programs had even one full-time staff member. This is understandable in view of the fact that the number of full-time program staff was directly proportional to the extent of divisional funding of these programs. In order to supplement scarce divisional disbursements, a fairly large number of programs obtained outside funding for a sizable portion of their research endeavors. Problems that were directly related to funding, such as inadaquate staff size, insufficient time to complete projects, and inability to meet rising requests for research information were also

PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS
BY GOAL CATEGORIES, KINDS OF
RESEARCH, AND GOAL PRIORITY LEVELS

ch	Priority Level	Kind of Research	Student Characteristics	Environmental Characteristics	Organization Development	Management Information Systems	Evaluation and Assessment	Research Development	General Self Studies	General Statements	% No
	1	Exp.	20.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	11.1	2.2	2.2	4.4	88.2
		Non-Exp.	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.2	2.2	90.2
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	90.2
	2	Exp.	9.5	2.4	4.8	14.3	7.1	2.4	0.0	2.4	82.3
		Non-Exp.	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	84.3
		Eval.	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.3
	3	Exp.	5.9	2.9	5.9	5.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	14.7	66.7
		Non-Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	70.6
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	70.6
	1	Exp.	22.2	2.2	0.0	2.2	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.4	88.2
		Non-Exp.	10.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	90.2
		Eval.	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.2
	2	Exp.	14.3	2.4	0.0	2.4	11.9	0.0	0.0	11.9	82.3
		Non-Exp.	7.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	4.7	84.3
		Eval.	4.7	0.0	2.3	4.7	4.7	0.0	0.0	7.0	84.3
	3	Exp.	5.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	14.7	8.8	2.9	5.9	66.7
		Non-Exp.	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	5.6	5.6	0.0	5.6	70.6
		Eval.	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	8.3	2.8	0.0	8.3	70.6
	1	Exp.	2.2	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	88.2
		Non-Exp.	19.6	2.2	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.2
		Eval.	0.0	2.2	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	90.2
	2	Exp.	2.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	4.8	82.3
		Non-Exp.	4.6	2.3	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.3
		Eval.	4.6	2.3	0.0	4.6	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	84.3
	3	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	5.9	66.7
		Non-Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.6
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	8.3	2.8	0.0	2.8	70.6
	1	Exp.	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	88.2
		Non-Exp.	6.5	0.0	2.2	4.3	6.5	0.0	0.0	4.3	90.2
		Eval.	6.5	0.0	4.3	6.5	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	90.2
	2	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	82.3
		Non-Exp.	4.6	0.0	2.3	4.6	9.3	0.0	0.0	4.6	84.3
		Eval.	11.6	2.3	2.3	2.3	7.0	2.3	0.0	9.3	84.3
	3	Exp.	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	66.7
		Non-Exp.	5.5	0.0	2.8	8.3	5.5	0.0	0.0	8.3	70.6
		Eval.	8.3	0.0	5.5	8.3	5.5	2.8	2.8	8.3	70.6
	1	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.2
		Non-Exp.	8.7	0.0	2.2	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	6.5	90.2
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	90.2
	2	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.3
		Non-Exp.	7.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	7.0	84.3
		Eval.	2.3	0.0	2.3	2.3	7.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	84.3
	3.	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7
		Non-Exp.	2.8	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	2.8	8.3	70.6
		Eval.	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	70.6
	1	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.2
		Non-Exp.	8.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	90.2
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.2
	2.	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.3
		Non-Exp.	2.3	2.3	0.0	4.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	84.3
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.3
	3	Exp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7
		Non-Exp.	2.8	0.0	2.8	2.8	5.5	0.0	0.0	2.8	70.6
		Eval.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.6

prevalent. In addition, a large number of programs indicated interest in cost-sharing and cooperative project design efforts on an inter-institutional basis.

In general, the impact of decreasing institutional resources seems to be reflected in the rather low levels of program staffing and funding. From a broader perspective, however, one might wonder if the substantial contributions which these programs may be making were being overlooked. Although the field of institutional research is not new, it has only recently emerged as a viable and necessary component of higher education administration. In recent years this field has experienced considerable success in providing institutional information such as attrition rates, student-faculty ratios, course scheduling systems, physical space allocation models and budget breakdowns. Nevertheless,there remains a need for institutional research which has as its primary purpose the identification of student needs and the measurement of the extent to which various campus environments meet such needs. It is in this realm, the realm of the development of the total student, that student affairs research may make significant contributions to the easing of tensions created by scarce resources. As a component of or counterpart to institutional research, it has the potential to bridge the gap between the more traditional and more contemporary notions of individual and institutional growth. Likewise, the information which these programs can provide may have substantial value to decision-makers who are simultaneously confronted with changing student needs and decreasing program budgets. In the final analysis the future of such programs will probably not rest upon the extent to which management information systems are implemented, but rather, upon which kinds of information institutions will choose to include in their decision-making processes.

A P P E N D I C E S

I. Institutions Surveyed

II. The Questionnaire

III. Student Affairs Research Programs

IV. Program Purposes and Goals

APPENDIX I

UNIVERSITIES SURVEYED

lphi University
versity of Akron
versity of Alabama
versity of Alaska at Anchorage
versity of Alaska at Fairbanks
versity of Alaska at Juneau
versity of Alaska at Ketchikan
versity of Alaska at Sitka
rican University
zona State University
versity of Arizona
versity of Arkansas at Little Rock
versity of Arkansas at Fayetteville
versity of Arkansas at Monticello
urn University at Montgomery
urn University at Auburn
l State University
lor University
ston College
ston University
ling Green State University at Bowling Green
ling Green State University at Huron
adley University
ndeis University
gham Young University
ler University
versity of California at Berkeley
versity of California at Davis
versity of California at Irvine
versity of California at Los Angeles
versity of California at LaJolla
versity of California at Riverside
versity of California at Santa Barbara
versity of California at Santa Cruz
rnegie-Mello University
se Western Reserve University
holis University of America
versity of Chicago
versity of Cincinnati at Cincinnati
versity of Cincinnati at Blue Ash
mson University at Greenville
mson University at Clemson
mson University at Sumter
versity of Colorado at Colorado Springs
versity of Colorado at Boulder
versity of Colorado at Boulder

Colorado State University
Columbia University--Barnard Campus
Columbia University--Main Campus
University of Connecticut at Hartford
University of Connecticut at Storrs
University of Connecticut at Groton
University of Connecticut at Stanford
University of Connecticut at Torrington
University of Connecticut at Waterbury
Cornell University
Creighton University
University of Delaware
University of Denver
Depaul University
University of Detroit
Drake University
Duke University
Duquesne University
Emory University
Fayetteville State University
Florida Agriculture and Mech. University
Florida State University
University of Florida
Fordham University
George Mason University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
University of Georgia
Harvard University
University of Hawaii at Hilo
University of Hawaii at Manda
University of Houston
Howard University
Iowa State University at Ames
University of Iowa
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Urbana
Indiana University East at Richmond
Indiana University at Fort Wayne
Indiana University at Indianapolis
Indiana University at Kokomo
Indiana University at Gary
Indiana University at South Bend
Indiana University at Jeffersonville
University of Idaho at Moscow
Indiana State University at Evansville
Indiana State University at Terre Haute

Indiana University at Bloomington
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas State University
University of Kansas
Kent State University at Ashtabula
Kent State University at E. Liverpool
Kent State University at Kent
Kent State University at Salem
Kent State University at No. Canton
Kent State University at Warren
Kent State University at New Philadelphia
University of Kentucky at Lexington
Long Island University at Brooklyn
Long Island University at Southampton
Louisiana State University at Alexandria
Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge
Louisiana State University at Eunice
Louisiana State University at New Orleans
Louisiana State University at Shreveport
Loyola University, Chicago
Loyola University, New Orleans
University of Maine at Augusta
University of Maine at Bangor
University of Maine at Farmington
University of Maine at Fort Kent
University of Maine at Machias
University of Maine at Orono
University of Maine at Portland
University of Maine at Presque Isle
University of Maryland at Baltimore
University of Maryland at College Park
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
University of Miami at Coral Gables
Miami University at Hamilton
Miami University at Oxford
Miami University at Middletown
University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
University of Michigan at Dearborn
University of Michigan at Flint
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota at Duluth
University of Minnesota at Minneapolis
University of Minnesota at Morris
University of Minnesota at Waseca
University of Minnesota at Crookston
University of Mississippi at University
Mississippi State University
University of Missouri at Kansas City
University of Missouri at Columbia
University of Missouri at Rolla
University of Missouri at St. Louis
Montana State University
University of Montana
University of Nebraska at Lincoln
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Nevada
University of New Hampshire
University of New Mexico at Gallup
University of New Mexico at Albuquerq
New Mexico State University at Grants
New Mexico State University at Las Cr
New Mexico State University at Alamog
New Mexico State University at Carlsb
New Mexico State University at Farmin
University of North Carolina at Chape
Hill
North Carolina State University at
Raleigh
North Dakota State University at Bott
North Dakota State University at Farg
University of North Dakota at Grand F
University of North Dakota at Willist
Northeastern University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
North Texas State University
University of Notre Dame
New York University
Ohio State University at Lima
Ohio State University at Mansfield
Ohio State University at Newark
Ohio State University at Columbus
Ohio State University at Marion
Ohio University at St. Clairsville
Ohio University at Chillicothe
Ohio University at Lancaster
Ohio University at Ironton
Ohio University at Athens
Ohio University at Portsmouth
Ohio University at Zanesville
University of Oklahoma at Norman
Oklahoma State University at Stillwat
Oklahoma State University at Oklahoma
University of Oregon
Oregon State University
University of Pacific
Pennsylvania State University at Alle
Pennsylvania State University at Alto
Pennsylvania State University at Mona
Pennsylvania State University at Erie
Pennsylvania State University at Read
Pennsylvania State University at
Middletown
Pennsylvania State University at Medi

nsylvania State University at Dubois
nsylvania State University at Uniontown
nsylvania State University at Hazleton
nsylvania State University at King of Prussa
nsylvania State University at McKeesport
nsylvania State University at University Park
nsylvania State University at New Kensington
nsylvania State University at Mont Alto
nsylvania State University at Abington
nsylvania State University at Shuylkill Haven
nsylvania State University at Sharon
nsylvania State University at Wilkes-Barre
nsylvania State University at Dunmore
nsylvania State University at York
iversity of Pittsburg at Bradford
iversity of Pittsburg at Greensburg
iversity of Pittsburg at Johnstown
iversity of Pittsburg at Pittsburg
iversity of Pittsburg at Titusville
iversity of Portland
tt Institute
nceton University
iversity of Puerto Rico at Cayey
iversity of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez
iversity of Puerto Rico at Rio Piedras
due University at Hammond
due University at Fort Wayne
due University at Lafayette
due University at Westville
iversity of Pennsylvania
nselaer Polytechnic Institute
iversity of Rhode Island
e University
iversity of Rochester
gers University at Camden
gers University at New Brunswick
gers University at Newark
nt John's University
nt Louis University at St. Louis
on Hall University
iversity of South Carolina at Aiken
iversity of South Carolina at Beaufort
iversity of South Carolina at Lancaster
iversity of South Carolina at Conway
iversity of South Carolina at Columbia
iversity of South Carolina at Spartanburg
iversity of South Carolina at Union
South Dakota State University
University of South Dakota at Vermillion
University of South Dakota at Springfield
Southeastern Methodist University
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Stanford University
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Buffalo
Syracuse University at Syracuse
Syracuse University at Utica
Temple University at Ambler
Temple University at Philadelphia
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
University of Tennessee at Martin
University of Tennessee at Memphis
University of Tennessee at Nashville
Texas A & M University
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at Dallas
Texas Christian University
Texas Technical University
Texas Woman's University
University of Toledo
Tufts University
Tulane University
University of Tulsa
Utah State University
University of Utah
Vanderbilt University
University of Vermont
Villanova University
Virginia Commonwealth University
University of Virginia at Wise
University of Virginia at Charlottesville
Virginia Poly Institute & State Universit
Wake Forest University
Washington State University
Washington University
University of Washington
Wayne State University
West Virginia University
Wichita State University
University of Wisconsin at Madison
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
University of Wyoming
Yale University
Yeshiva University

APPENDIX II

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DURHAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03824

STUDENTS OFFICE
hofield House

April 5, 1974

ar Colleague:

In follow-up to the letter of announcement sent to you about a week ago, pleas nd enclosed your copy of the National Survey of Student Affairs Research Questionire. I hope that you will take the necessary few minutes to look it over and compte it after reading the preliminary directions and definitions (below).

This questionnaire should be completed by the individual responsible for the oadest range of research in your division, given the following order of position eferences: (1) Coordinator or Director of Research with responsibility at the Division level, (2) Coordinator or Director of Research with responsibility at the Dean Students Office level, or (3) the Dean of Students.

For the Purposes of this survey, the following definitions are provided:

Division: Those administrative units within your institution which come under your chief student affairs officer.

Research: Any systematized search for knowledge or information which may vary in its degree of rigor and may include experimental, non-experimental, or evaluative research unless otherwise specified in the enclosed questionnaire.

Office: An administrative unit or department with responsibility for the direction and/or coordination of the majority of the student affairs research projects within your division.

Program: In the absence of an Office of Student Affairs Research, 'program' is intended to mean those projects which comprise the major portion of the student affairs research endeavors at your institution which are under the coordination and/or direction of a full- or part-time staff member.

Due to a need to complete data processing as soon as possible, it would be ppreciated if you would return the completed questionnaire within 5 working days. f you would like to receive a copy of the survey report, mark the appropriate answer pace after completing the questionnaire.

Looking forward to receiving your response in the not-too-distant future, remain,

Sincerely yours,

Paul R. Poduska

Paul R. Poduska
Assistant Dean of Students
for Research and Planning

RP:mfj

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

National Survey of
Student Affairs Research

INSTRUCTIONS: (1) In the right-hand column **place an "X" (X)** in the appropriate answer space(s) after each question (item). (2) In addition, on the left-hand side of the page **place an "X" [X]** by the question (item) letters that are of greatest interest/importance to you. Items that require only **ONE** answer are so marked. **Please Return Your Completed Questionnaire Within Five Working Days From Date Of Receipt.** (Addressed Return Envelope Enclosed)

I. Background Information:

[] A. Your Institution/Campus: _____

[] B. In Which NASPA Region Is Your Institution? (Select ONE)

Region I	= Ct,Me,Mar Prov,Ma,NH,RI,Vt	-- (
Region II	= CZ,De,DC,Md,NJ,NY,Pa,PR,VI	-- (
Region III	= Al,Fl,Ga,Ky,La,Mex,Ms,NC,SC,Tn,Tx,Va	-- (
Region IV (E)	= Il,In,Ia,Mi,Mn,Oh,Ont,WV,Wi	-- (
Region IV (W)	= Az,Ar,Co,Ks,Man,Mo,Nb,NM,ND,Ok,Sask,SD,Wy	-- (
Region V	= Ak,Alb,BC,Id,Mo,Nv,Or,Ut,Wa	-- (
Region VI	= Ca,Gu,Hi	-- (

[] C. Total Student Enrollment: (Select ONE)

1,000 - 5,000 (
5,000 - 10,000 (
10,000 - 15,000 (
15,000 - 20,000 (
Over 20,000 (

[] D. Is Your Institution Public or Private?

Public (
Private (

[] E. Is Your Division Currently Engaged in Student Affairs Research and/or Evaluation Projects?

Research (
Evaluation (
Neither (

[] F. If "Research" and/or "Evaluation" for E (above), How Many Years Have You Been Engaged in Such Projects? (Select ONE)

Less Than One (
One To Three (
Three To Five (
More Than Five (

[] G. If "Neither" for E (above), Does Your Division Plan to Become Engaged in Student Affairs Research or Evaluation?

Yes (
No (

OP HERE IF YOUR ANSWER TO QUESTION E WAS "NEITHER." Please Return Questionnaire in

---

II. Your Research Organization, Resources, and Facilities:

[] A. Number of Staff in Your Division Presently Engaged in Full-Time Research in Student Affairs: (Select ONE)

One (
Two Or Three (
Four Or More (
None (

Number Of Staff in Your Division Presently Engaged in Part-Time Research in Student Affairs, Including Students and Paraprofessional Staff: (Select ONE)

One ( ) 14-
Two To Four ( ) -
Five To Eight ( ) -
None ( ) -

( )

Do You Have a Director for Student Affairs Research or a Staff Member Who Assumes This Responsibility (Full- or Part-Time)?

Yes ( ) 15-
No ( ) -

If "Yes" for C (above), to Whom Does He or She Report? (Specify Below)

Percentage of Your 1973-74 Divisional Budget Allocated for Student Affairs Research: (Select ONE)

1 - 3 ( ) 16-
4 - 6 ( ) -
7 - 10 ( ) -
More Than 10 ( ) -

Percentage of Your 1973-74 Research Budget Procured from Sources Outside of Your Institution: (Select ONE)

1 - 5 ( ) 17-
6 - 10 ( ) -
11 - 20 ( ) -
21 - 40 ( ) -
More Than Forty ( ) -
None ( ) -

Do You Plan to Spend More or Less Time Seeking Funding for Student Affairs Research from Outside Sources? (Select ONE)

More ( ) 18-
Less ( ) -
No Change ( ) -

Are Your Computer Facilities at Your Institution Adequate and Sufficiently Accessible for Your Research Needs?

Adequate ( ) 19-
Accessible ( ) 20-
Neither ( ) 21-

Do You Use Statistical Packages Such As S.P.S.S. or BioMed During Your Data Analysis?

Yes ( ) 22-
No ( ) -

our Research Process and Content:

Given the Following Definitions (below), What Percentages of Your Resources Are Allocated for Each of the Following Kinds of Research? (Select ONE From Each Category)

1. "Experimental Research": Statements of Formal Hypotheses, Statements of Dependent and Independent Variables, Controls for Extraneous Variables, Theoretical Contexts, etc.

1 - 10 ( ) 23-
10 - 20 ( ) -
20 - 40 ( ) -
More Than Forty ( ) -
None ( ) -

2. "Non-Experimental Research": Informal or No Statement of Hypotheses, Dependent and Independent Variables Not Specified, Few or No Controls for Extraneous Variables, etc. (E.g., Opinion Polling, Needs Analysis, Case Studies)

1 - 10 ( ) 24
10 - 20 ( ) -
20 - 40 ( ) -
40 - 70 ( ) -
More Than 70 ( ) -
None ( ) -

3. "Evaluation": Methods of Assessing Staff, Program, Departmental, and/or Divisional Effectiveness; Experimental or Non-Experimental.

1 - 10 ( ) 25-
10 - 20 ( ) -
20 - 40 ( ) -
40 - 70 ( ) -
More Than 70 ( ) -
None ( ) -

[] B. Which of the Following Validated Instruments Have You Used in Research?

1. "College and University Environmental Scales" (C.U.E.S.) -- ( )
2. "College Student Questionnaire" (C.S.Q.) -- ( )
3. "College Characteristics Inventory" (C.C.I.) -- ( )
4. "Biographical Inventory for Students" (B.I.S.) -- ( )
5. "Group Dimensions Descriptive Questionnaire" (G.D.D.Q.) -- ( )
6. "Omnibus Personality Inventory" (O.P.I.) -- ( )
7. "Stern Activity Index" (S.A.I.) -- ( )
8. "Institutional Goals Inventory" (I.G.I.) -- ( )
9. "Inventory of College Activities" (I.C.A.) -- ( )
10. "Adjective Check List" (A.C.L.) -- ( )
11. "Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory" (M.M.P.I.) -- ( )

None ( )

Other (Specify Below) ( )

[] C. What Percentage of Your Research Instrumentation Is of Your Own Design/Creation? (Select ONE)

1 - 5 ( )
5 - 20 ( )
20 - 50 ( )
50 - 80 ( )
More Than Eighty ( )
None ( )

[] D. What Percentage of Your Research Time is Spent in Collaboration With the Following Departments or Departmental Areas at Your Institution?

1. Office of Institutional Research:

1 - 10 ( )
10 - 30 ( )
30 - 50 ( )
More Than Fifty ( )
None ( )

2. Academic Departments:

1 - 10 ( )
10 - 30 ( )
30 - 50 ( )
More Than Fifty ( )
None ( )

3. Administrative Department Not Within Your Division:

1 - 10 ( )
10 - 30 ( )
30 - 50 ( )
More Than Fifty ( )
None ( )

[] E. Please Briefly State the Purpose of Your Office or Program of Student Affairs Research:

Our Purpose Is To...

F. Please Briefly State Your Three Most Important Research Goals: (Prioritized).

#1. _____ 43/44

#2. _____ 45/46

#3. _____ 47/48

G. What Percentage of Your Research Is Intentionally Designed to Meet the Needs, Priorities, Goals, and/or Objectives of Your Student Affairs Decision-Makers? (Select ONE)

1 - 10 ( ) 49-
10 - 30 ( ) -
30 - 50 ( ) -
More Than Fifty ( ) -
None ( ) -

H. What Percentage of Your Time Is Allocated for Educating Your Colleagues Regarding the Value and Uses of Student Affairs Research? (Select ONE)

1 - 10 ( ) 50-
10 - 30 ( ) -
30 - 50 ( ) -
More Than Fifty ( ) -
None ( ) -

I. Does Your Office or Program of Student Affairs Research View Research As a Contribution Toward Accountability in the Area of Student Affairs? (Select ONE)

Yes ( ) 51-
No ( ) -
Undecided ( ) -

J. What Kinds of Problems Have You Encountered in Your Research?

Financial ( ) 52-
Design ( ) 53-
Instrumentation ( ) 54-
Data Processing ( ) 55-
Assessing Administrative Needs ( ) 56-
Reporting ( ) 57-
Evaluation Of Research ( ) 58-
None ( ) 59-
Other (Specify Below) ( ) 60-

K. In Which of the Following Areas Would You Be Interested in Interinstitutional Cooperation in Regard to Your Student Affairs Research Program(s).

Cost-Sharing ( ) 61-
Project Design ( ) 62
Information-Sharing ( ) 63-
None ( ) 64-
Other (Specify Below) ( ) 65-

L. Does Your Office or Program Plan to Become Involved in Any of the Following in the Near Future?

1. Management By Objectives (M.B.O.) -- ( ) 67-
2. Management Information Systems (M.I.S.) -- ( ) 68-
3. Program Evaluation -- ( ) 69-
4. Model Building -- ( ) 70-
5. Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems (P.P.B.S.) -- ( ) 71-
6. Simulation -- ( ) 72-

None ( ) 73-
Other (Specify Below) ( ) 74-

[] M. In Which of the Following Areas Have You, Are You, and Will You Be Conducting Student Affairs Research?

AREAS	PAST	PRESENT
1. Orientation	( ) 75-1	( ) 76-1
2. Academic Advising	( ) 78-1	( ) 79-1
3. Food Services	( ) 5-1	( ) 6-1
4. Financial Aid	( ) 8-1	( ) 9-1
5. Placement	( ) 11-1	( ) 12-1
6. Admissions	( ) 14-1	( ) 15-1
7. Counseling and Testing	( ) 17-1	( ) 18-1
8. Housing	( ) 20-1	( ) 21-1
9. Recreation	( ) 23-1	( ) 24-1
10. Judicial	( ) 26-1	( ) 27-1
11. Student Organization	( ) 29-1	( ) 30-1
12. Student Needs (Assessments)	( ) 32-1	( ) 33-1
13. Student Attitudes (Surveys)	( ) 35-1	( ) 36-1
14. Staff Training	( ) 38-1	( ) 39-1
15. Office Management	( ) 41-1	( ) 42-1
16. Other (Specify Below)		
a. _____	44 ( ) 45-1	( ) 46-1
b. _____	48 ( ) 49-1	( ) 50-1
c. _____	52 ( ) 53-1	( ) 54-1
d. _____	56 ( ) 57-1	( ) 58-1

[] N. Are You Presently Engaged in the Design, Implementation and/or Evaluation of Longitudinal Research Projects? Yes No

[] O. Would You Be Interested in Receiving a Student Affairs Research Newsletter? Yes No

IV. About This Questionnaire:

[] A. Did You Find This Questionnaire Educational and/or Informative? Yes No

[] B. Were Critical Areas Concerning Student Affairs Research Omitted from This Questionnaire? (If "Yes," Please Specify Below) Yes No

(Areas Omitted Were): _____

_____

_____

[] C. How Many Minutes Did It Take You To Complete This Questionnaire? (Select ONE)

1 - 5
5 - 10
10 - 20
More Than 20

[] D. Do You Desire a Final Copy of the Results of This Survey? Yes No

APPENDIX III

INSTITUTIONS ENGAGED IN STUDENT AFFAIRS RESEARCH ON A PROGRAMMATIC BASIS

Region One (Ct, Me, Mar Prov, Ma, NH, RI, Vt)

University of Maine at Orono
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
University of New Hampshire

Region Two (CZ, De, DC, Md, NJ, NY, Pa, PR, VI)

Carnegie-Mellon University
Cornell University
Howard University
University of Maryland at College Park
Pennsylvania State University at Monaca
University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez
University of Rochester
Saint John's University
State University of New York at Buffalo
Villanova University
(One Institution Did Not Identify Itself)

Region Three (Al, Fl, Ga, Ky, La, Mex, Ms, NC, SC, Tn, Tx, Va)

Florida State University
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of South Carolina at Columbia
Southeastern Methodist University
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Memphis
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Region Four-East (Il, In, Ia, Mi, Mn, Oh, Ont, WV, Wi)

Ball State University
Drake University
Iowa State University at Ames
University of Illinois at Chicago
Indiana State University at Terre Haute
Indiana University at Bloomington
Kent State University at Kent
Kent State University at New Philadelphia
Miami University at Oxford

Michigan State University
University of Minnesota at Minneapolis
Ohio State University at Columbus
Ohio University at Chillicothe
Ohio University at Athens
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
West Virginia University

Region Four-West (Az, Ar, Co, Ks, Man, Mo, Nb, NM, ND, Ok, Sask, SD, Wy)

University of Colorado at Boulder
Colorado State University
Kansas State University
University of Missouri at Kansas City
University of Nebraska at Lincoln
Oklahoma State University at Stillwater
(One Institution Did Not Identify Itself)

Region Five (Ak, Alb, BC, Id, Mo, Nv, Or, Ut, Wa)

Oregon State University
Washington State University

Region Six (Ca, Gu, Hi)

University of California at Berkeley
University of California at Davis
University of California at Santa Barbara
Stanford University

APPENDIX LV

PURPOSES AND GOALS OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The following are lists of program purpose and goal statements which are rank-ordered by frequency of occurrence across all research programs. Goal statements are listed in goal priority level groups.

PROGRAM PURPOSES

Rank-Ordered Statements		Frequency of Occurrences (Percent)
1.	Evaluate program effectiveness using student needs	29.4
2.	Provide student characteristics information to campus	15.7
3.	Provide a research resource	11.8
4.	Provide data for program development-change	7.8
4.	Evaluate institutional environments	7.8
5.	Evaluate services	5.9
5.	Stimulate program development	5.9
5.	Determine student characteristics and demographic data	5.9
5.	Train staff in research methods	5.9
5.	Conduct research	5.9
5.	Provide data to improve decision-making	5.9
5.	Understand student characteristics and needs	5.9
6.	Provide recommendations for policies and procedures	3.9
6.	Evaluate student needs-interests-attitudes	3.9
6.	Learn about total student development and best possible education	3.9
6.	Evaluate research program relevancy	3.9
6.	Inform campus regarding research activities	3.9
6.	Assess student educative experiences	3.9
6.	Identify dissertation research problems	3.9
6.	Evaluate decision-making	3.9
6.	Develop research programs	3.9
7.	Evaluate organizational structure using student needs	2.0
7.	Gave unrelated information	2.0
7.	Improve student services	2.0
7.	Conduct division-wide research	2.0
7.	Develop program evaluation techniques	2.0
7.	Determine student commitment to campus-programs	2.0
7.	Determine retention-dropout factors	2.0
7.	Determine institutional environment factors	2.0
7.	Determine academic success-failure factors	2.0
7.	Determine prediction analysis modes	2.0
7.	Determine student vocational program needs	2.0
7.	Evaluate division objectives	2.0
7.	Study student-faculty needs	2.0
7.	Evaluate instructional programs in student affairs	2.0

7.	Develop marketing analysis format	2.0
7.	Contribute to body of student affairs knowledge	2.0
7.	Provide information for grant applications	2.0
7.	Relate research to academic programs	2.0
7.	Relate research to management of division	2.0
7.	Develop computer-based student research information systems	2.0
7.	Cooperative interinstitutional research projects	2.0
7.	Determine transfer student needs	2.0
7.	Evaluate transfer student delivery systems	2.0
7.	Evaluation of Orientation	2.0
7.	Evaluation of withdrawal procedures	2.0
7.	Develop a profile of student performance	2.0
7.	Cost-benefit analysis of programs	2.0
7.	Understand staff goals	2.0

PROGRAM
GOALS

FIRST PRIORITY

Rank-Ordered Statements		Frequency of Occurrences (Percent)
1.	Information about student body	8.5
2.	Assess student need priorities	4.3
3.	Understanding "dropouts"	2.1
3.	Identify and understand student problem areas	2.1
3.	Understand student needs/characteristics	2.1
3.	Demographic data on students	2.1
3.	Identify student characteristics	2.1
3.	Longitudinal study of student concerns	2.1
3.	Assess and identify relevant student differences and similarities	2.1
3.	Concerns and needs of minority students	2.1
3.	Describe characteristics of students	2.1
3.	Determine student needs and attitudes	2.1
3.	Develop student profile	2.1
3.	Survey of the student life area	2.1
3.	Comprehensive data regarding individual and group student development	2.1
3.	Know student interests/needs	2.1
3.	Assess student perceptions of various aspects of environment	2.1
3.	Generating data for change	2.1
3.	Development of commitment in staff	2.1
3.	Facilitate effective use of resources	2.1
3.	Data and results useful in institutional decision-making	2.1
3.	Operational and management goals and performance	2.1

3.	Organize and make available all data already collected	2.1
3.	To obtain and provide useful information for university decision-makers	2.1
3.	Set guidelines for planning student services	2.1
3.	Assess Student Services	2.1
3.	Assistance and monitoring of Admissions decisions	2.1
3.	Determine whether programs and services meet student needs	2.1
3.	Evaluation by students	2.1
3.	Evaluate outcome of student educative services	2.1
3.	Test effectiveness of our programs	2.1
3.	Evaluate effectiveness of local student affairs projects	2.1
3.	Program evaluation	2.1
3.	Multiphasic student evaluation systems	2.1
3.	Develop models for needs assessment	2.1
3.	Most appropriate role for student services	2.1
3.	Accuracy	2.1
3.	Program development	2.1
3.	Well defined accurate studies	2.1
3.	Attainment of area goals	2.1
3.	Not yet fully established	2.1
3.	Evaluate staff/program project	2.1
3.	Divisional costs	2.1

SECOND PRIORITY

Rank-Ordered Statements		Frequency of Occurrence (Percent)
1.	Program evaluation	6.8
2.	Determine student needs and attitudes	4.5
3.	Identify student needs and interpret to institution	2.3
3.	Determine needs of commuter students	2.3
3.	Determine needs of transfer students	2.3
3.	Identify student characteristics	2.3
3.	Counseling needs - "special" populations	2.3
3.	Assess student need priorities	2.3
3.	Collective data for individual married studies	2.3
3.	Orientation information for commuters	2.3
3.	Research for placement of students	2.3
3.	Survey of reenrolled students	2.3
3.	Assess student perceptions of various aspects of environment	2.3
3.	Develop sensory system for environmental development	2.3
3.	Educate staff to advantage of data for decision-making	2.3
3.	Evaluation of department efficiency	2.3
3.	Update service programs	2.3
3.	Develop data base on students	2.3
3.	Provide basic data to University governing body	2.3
3.	Determine priorities - budget purposes	2.3
3.	Develop effective MBO Program within division	2.3
3.	Provide answers to questions from high-level administration	2.3

3.	Develop longitudinal data base	2.3
3.	Ascertain relevancy of student affairs programs to students	2.3
3.	Research for admissions and counseling	2.3
3.	Assess student services	2.3
3.	Evaluation of educational process and programs	2.3
3.	Evaluation or assessment of staff performance	2.3
3.	Evaluate divisional goals/objectives	2.3
3.	Evaluation by faculty, staff	2.3
3.	Comprehensive use of data	2.3
3.	Develop model for evaluating department programs	2.3
3.	Improve student programs	2.3
3.	Provide information on and off campus	2.3
3.	Applicability	2.3
3.	Voluntary action	2.3
3.	Attainment of office goals	2.3
3.	Ongoing useful research programs	2.3
3.	Insure quality	2.3
3.	Relate student life policies to student development	2.3
3.	Impact of university environment	2.3

THIRD PRIORITY

Rank-Ordered Statements		Frequency of Occurrence (Percent)
1.	Educate staff to advantage of data for decision-making	5.6
1.	Data and results useful in institutional decision-making	5.6
1.	Program evaluation	5.6
2.	Fill requests of admissions concerning transfer activities	2.8
2.	General characteristics - changing student needs	2.8
2.	Describe characteristics of students	2.8
2.	Survey of graduating seniors	2.8
2.	Student adaptation to "milieu"	2.8
2.	Provide professional growth for staff	2.8
2.	Use of data for decision-making	2.8
2.	Determine priorities - planning activities	2.8
2.	Divisional costs, cost-effectiveness	2.8
2.	Collect and integrate information on futuristics in order to anticipate and plan programs	2.8
2,	Evaluation of educational process and programs	2.8
2.	Evaluation of present services	2.8
2.	Evaluation of Veteran Student Affairs program	2.8
2.	Evaluation by students	2.8
2.	Identify success/failure factors	2.8
2.	Test effectiveness of our programs	2.8
2.	Assist faculty, staff, students in their own research	2.8
2.	Model for improved academic advanced program	2.8
2.	Comprehensive communication and use of research results	2.8
2.	Support instructional or program research/evaluation	2.8
2.	Advance knowledge	2.8

2.	Learning about and evaluating programs and practices of other schools	2.8
2.	Publication	2.8
2.	Generalizability	2.8
2.	Career development	2.8
2.	Communicate findings to academic staff in teaching and advising capacity	2.8
2.	To advance the theory of student personnel services	2.8
2.	Relate student life to the learning process	2.8
2.	Evaluate staff/program project	2.8
2.	Cost effectiveness	2.8